

Another Endless Chain.

Secretary Gage recently appeared before a House committee and urged the enactment of a law specifically requiring silver dollars to be redeemed in gold on demand. He argued that, as the legal tender law makes silver the equivalent of gold, the government might as well offer to furnish gold in exchange for silver as to allow silver to be presented in payment of revenues. To use his own expression:

The government might just as well face the situation and meet this silver with its right hand at the front door as to take it with the left hand at the back door.

And this is the reasoning of a financier! He sees no difference between a credit money and a standard money; he thinks it a matter of no moment that his plan reduces the quantity of basic money and increases the quantity of redeemable money—or, in other words, contracts the foundation and expands the super-structure.

But of this later. It is worth while to point out at this time that the argument now made by Secretary Gage is similar to the argument which led to the custom of redeeming treasury notes in gold, although the practice of redeeming treasury notes in gold simply surrendered the government's option to select the coin and did not convert a standard money into a credit money. After the custom of redeeming in gold was established the financiers pointed out that the redemption and re-issue of treasury notes formed what they called an endless chain for the draining of the treasury. This argument was used with great effect in securing the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Law. As soon as that legislation was accomplished the financiers set to work to secure the retirement of the greenbacks as well as the treasury notes on the ground that the greenbacks also constituted an endless chain when redeemed and re-issued. Now that the greenbacks and treasury notes are in process of retirement an attack is to be made upon the silver dollar.

The argument that worked so well against government paper is now to be used against coin. The present law does not require the redemption of silver dollars; a bill containing such a provision passed the House a year ago but a republican Senate was not willing to go on record as favoring such a measure at the beginning of a presidential campaign, so the matter was left to executive construction.

Now that the election is over the republican leaders are a little more bold and will probably make the law specific in requiring redemption.

Next will come the demand for the retirement of silver dollars by an issue of bonds, or for a withdrawal of their legal tender qualities.

As a reason for retiring silver we will be told that a silver dollar redeemed and then re-issued forms another endless chain. It will be pointed out that there is no limit to the amount of gold that may be drained from the treasury if silver dollars are paid out again after they are once redeemed. The same argument made against the greenback and treasury note will be repeated against a redeemable silver dollar.

The redemption of the standard silver dollar is the first step toward its ultimate retirement and those who are opposed to its retirement will not be induced to aid in making it redeemable.

When the gold standard is complete, gold will be the only legal tender money and bank notes the only paper money. Until this end is reached the financiers will deprecate any agitation of the money question during campaigns and will spend the years between campaigns urging legislative enactments in furtherance of their plans.

Christianity Versus War.

Erasmus, whose words have echoed through three centuries, has this to say of the antagonism between Christianity and War:

Let us imagine we hear a soldier among these fighting Christians saying the Lord's Prayer just before battle. Our Father! says he. O, hardened wretch! Can you call God Father, when you are just going out to cut your brother's throat?—Hallowed be Thy name. How can the name of God be more impiously unhallowed than by mutual bloody murder among his sons?—Thy kingdom come. Do you pray for the coming of His kingdom while you are endeavoring to establish an earthly despotism by spilling the blood of God's sons and subjects?—Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven. His will in Heaven is for peace; but you are now meditating war.—Give us this day our daily bread. How dare you say this to your Father in Heaven at the moment that you are going to burn your brother's corn fields and would rather lose the benefit of them yourself than suffer him to enjoy them unmolested?—Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. With what face can you pray thus, when, so far from forgiving your brother, you are going with all the haste you can, to murder him in cold blood for an alleged trespass which, after all, is but imaginary?—Lead us not into temptation. And do you presume to deprecate temptation or danger—you who are not only rushing into it yourself, but doing all you can to force your brother into it?—Deliver us from evil. You pray to be delivered from evil, that is, from the evil being, Satan, to whose impulses you are now submitting yourself, and by whose spirit you are guided in contriving the greatest possible evil to your brother?

These sentiments, set forth and commented upon in the Peace Manual, are respectfully commended to those followers of the Nazarene who preach a strenuous gospel of bloodshed, and who imagine that they see God's hand directing a war waged for conquest and the extension of trade.

Trade-Unionism.

Mr. Wise, a member of the Australian Parliament, in a speech in favor of arbitration, sets forth the necessity for trade-unionism so forcibly that an extract is given below:

Trade-Unionism is, as I have said, to the laborer what capital is to the employer; and without trade-unionism we would not feel that there could be any real freedom of contract between the laborer and the employer.

Freedom only exists when those on either side are free to accept or reject the terms that are offered. To secure that freedom is the object of trade-unionism, because it recognizes that in order to have a fair bargain made, each party to the bargain must be on a footing of equality.

The labor organization not only helps those who belong to it, but it also helps those who are not members. For even those on the outside share to a greater or less extent in the better wages, the shorter hours and the more favorable conditions secured by the labor organizations. If unions or federations make mistakes it must be remembered that perfection is not to be expected in any work of human hands. The good done by these organizations far outweighs the errors which they have committed.

The Boers—God Bless Them.

The reports from South Africa revive the stories of ancient heroism. That a force so small should be able to hold the British army at bay and even re-take some of the surrendered cities seems too wonderful to be true. Millions here and throughout the world, who believe in self-government and deny the right of a strong nation to cast its sovereignty like a net over a weaker people, are watching with intense interest the unequal struggle of the Boers in defense of their independence. If they succeed in forcing a recognition of their republics, their victory will mark the turning point in the recent trend toward imperial ideas and their sacrifices will be of incalculable value to the human race. If, however, they fail and are compelled at last to submit to the English yoke, their valiant resistance will have furnished innumerable themes for poetry and song, and the lovers of liberty for centuries to come will find inspiration in their courage and patriotism.

We Have Imperialism Now.

Senator Teller is right in saying that imperialism is not a fear but a realization; not a thing to be warded off, but a thing to be abandoned.

In a recent speech in the senate he administered a well-deserved rebuke to those who prate about partial liberty and conditional self-government. He said:

I have not agreed with everybody who has been in fear of imperialism. I said two years ago last month in the Senate that there would not be any imperialism there, for the American people would not allow it. Since then I have seen in those islands an imperial government that has had no equal on the face of the earth, an imperial government that has not a counterpart anywhere under the heavens, an imperial government with five men, and five men only, strangers to the language, strangers to the country, unacquainted with the interests of the people, sitting there and administering government, taking the money of the people and appropriating it without their consent, ignoring the people entirely.

Mr. President, the czar of Russia is an absolute czar. He has a council of sixty men who sit with him and consider public affairs, but the sixty men are Russians. They are people of that country. They have their sympathies and their ambitions for Russia.

These men in the Philippine islands are strangers. Under the military law they have a right there undoubtedly, but under God's law, which is higher than that, they have no place there at all.

And so I take back what I said two years ago. Imperialism has come; it is there in its worst form, and what I want to know, like the senator from Maryland (Mr. Wellington), is, what are you going to do now? Are you going to keep up this imperialistic government? Are you going to continue to govern 12,000,000 people contrary to their wish, without a voice, without being heard, when your chief actor over there, General MacArthur, tells you that the people are a unit against this administration, when every Filipino in Europe today, and there are thousands of them, is against our government over there?

Contempt of Court.

The supreme court has decided that Cuba is foreign territory, held in trust by the people of the United States for the Cubans and to be turned over to them as soon as they shall have established a stable government by their voluntary action. Doubtless an X-ray photograph of the mind of Senator Beveridge while he was reading the opinion would have afforded ample ground for the infliction of the usual penalties for contempt of court.